

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 9, 2009, which was made final. Claims 1-20, 22, and 40 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 7-9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22, and 40 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. No new claims have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment does not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-19 include allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all the limitation of the claims from which they each originally depended. Claims 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, and 19 have been amended in the present response to include all the limitation of the claims from which they each originally depended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, and 19, and the claims that depend therefrom, are now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, as discussed below, claims 1 and 22 have been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 2, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable. Thus, claims 1 and 22, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung, et al (U.S Publication No. 2002/0169760, hereinafter “Cheung”) in view of Meisel, et al (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033292, hereinafter “Miesel”) and Kalagnanam, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,873,967, hereinafter “Kalagnanam”).

As discussed above, the Examiner indicated on page 4 of the present office action that dependent claim 2 includes allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 22 to include the subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 22, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and the rejection under § 103 has become moot.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung, in view of Meisel, and further in view of Kalagnanam.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 9, 2010

/William L. Jaffe/
William L. Jaffe
Reg. No. 64,977

Customer No. 08791
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300